

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
06/27/2003	Bor-Haw Chang	CHAN3204-EM	5327
01/17/2006		EXAMINER	
MAS, PLLC		TRIEU, TH	IERESA
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		3748	
	06/27/2003 01/17/2006 MAS, PLLC	06/27/2003 Bor-Haw Chang 01/17/2006 MAS, PLLC	06/27/2003 Bor-Haw Chang CHAN3204-EM 01/17/2006 EXAMI MAS, PLLC TRIEU, THANE ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<i>()</i> v
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/606,739	CHANG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Theresa Trieu	3748
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE STATE OF THE MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 O	ctober 2005.	
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,7,9 and 11 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,7,9,11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		·
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is responsive to the applicants' amendment filed on October 18, 2005.

Page 2

Claims 1, 7, 9 and 11 have been amended. Claims 4-6, 8 and 10 have been withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 7, 9, and 11 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-3, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by any one of Rao (Patent Number 3,883,264) or Kohama et al. (Kohama) (Patent Number 4,895,489).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Rao (as shown in Figs. 1-3) or Kohama (as shown in Figs. 1, 4 and 5) discloses an outlet airflow direction control unit, comprising:

a frame (13 in Rao; 1 in Kohama) having an inlet/outlet (not numbered; however, clearly seen in Fig. 1 in Rao; 6, 7 in Kohama), the outlet being provided on a peripheral wall with a plurality of radially projected fluid control elements being located adjacent to the outlet on an inner surface of the frame;

a fan (11 in Rao; 4 in Kohama) being supported in the frame (13 in Rao; 1 in Kohama), and disconnected from the fluid control elements (15, 16 in Rao; 5 in Kohama);

wherein the fan being rotatable to direct an amount of fluid into and out of the frame via the inlet and the outlet, respectively, and fluid control elements (15, 16; 19, 22, 26, 27

in Rao; 5 in Kohama) are arranged and configured so that a fluid flowing out from the outlet is directed to flow radially inward.

Regarding claims 2, 3 and 9, Rao or Kohama discloses the fluid control elements are control blades (15, 16; 19, 22, 26, 27 in Rao) or ribs (26, 27 in Rao; 5 in Kohama); the fan including a hub (12 in Rao; 3 in Kohama), and the fluid control elements (15, 16; 19, 22, 26, 27 in Rao; 5 in Kohama) to direct the fluid radially inward behind the hub when flowing out of the outlet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 3748

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao '264 in view of design choice.

Rao discloses the invention as recited above; however, Rao fails to disclose the control blades being as one of the T-shaped, L-shaped, and reverse L-shaped. It is examiner's position that one having ordinary skill in the rotary compressor art, would have found it obvious to utilize the shape of the control blades, since they are merely design parameters, depending on temperature, pressure, or stress acted/applied on the control blades or depending on for being used for a particular purpose, or solving a stated problem. Moreover, there is nothing in the record which establishes that the claimed the blades being T-shaped or L-shaped or reverse L-shaped under such conditions, presents a novel of unexpected result (See *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 7, 9 and 11 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Application/Control Number: 10/606,739

Art Unit: 3748

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Page 5

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Theresa Trieu whose telephone number is 571-272-4868. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am- 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas E. Denion can be reached on 571-272-4859. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TT

January 5, 2006

Theresa Trieu

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3748